<div align="center">**Remarks**</div>

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed January 8, 2008.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, Claims 1-55 and 57 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-55 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0125124 A1, here after Kim).

II.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, Claims 1-55 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0125124 A1, here after Kim).

Claim 1

Kim discloses methods for controlling the process of constructing and browsing a semantic hierarchy of a video by using, in part, a tree view of a video stream (Abstract). As disclosed by Kim, a video segment is defined as a structural unit comprising a set of video frames while a video sub-segment includes a subset of the video frames in a parent video segment. A video stream can be organized into a tree with a root and one or more child nodes at one or more levels. The root of the tree is a video segment containing all frames of the video stream, while each child node of the tree is a video sub-segment that includes a subset of the video frames in its parent node ([0017]).

It appears from the above description that, in Kim, trees are used to model video streams, and that nodes of trees represent a set of video frames. In contrast, in the embodiment defined by Claim 1, the control tree is a logical representation of the GUI and includes a set of controls representing graphical and functional elements of the GUI which are related hierarchically to one another. Thus, while Kim appears to disclose hierarchical relationships between sets of video frames, the embodiment defined by Claim 1 defines hierarchical relationships between controls representing graphical and functional elements of a GUI.

In view of the above comments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 30, 41, and 57

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 16, 30, 41, and 57 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-15, 17-29, 31-40, and 42-55

Claims 2-15, 17-29, 31-40, and 42-55 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-15, 17-29, 31-40, and 42-55 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

III.   **Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 3, 2008

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
　　　Guanyao Cheng
　　　Reg. No. 58,555

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910

11